

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

No claims are currently being canceled.

Claims 1, 8 and 13 are currently being amended.

No claims are currently being added.

This amendment amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-13 are now pending in this application.

Applicant respectfully requests that this 'after-final' amendment and reply be considered and entered, since it is believed to place this application in condition for allowance without materially affecting the scope of the claims.

It is noted with appreciation that claims 9-13 are not rejected over any cited art of record.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 8, and 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph, due to the negative limitation added by way of the previously-filed reply. Applicant has removed that negative limitation from presently pending independent claims 1 and 8, to thereby overcome this rejection with respect to those claims. In the interest of explanation, however, that negative limitation was based on Figure 1 of the drawings, whereby it is clear from that figure that the search engine 3 does not search the landmark database 2, but rather it searches databases on the World-Wide Web (not shown in Figure 1). Also, with respect to claims 9-13, please refer to Figure 7 of the drawings, whereby the landmark position database 54 is not part of the Web 55 (to thereby provide support for claims 10, 12 and 13), and please also refer to Figure 1 of the drawings which provides support in element 2 for the features

recited in claims 9 and 11. Accordingly, claims 9-13 are believed to fully comply with 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (specification, page 6, lines 10-20) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,307,573 to Barros; claims 2 and 4-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in view of Barros and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,577,714 to Darcie et al.; claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in view of Barros and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,633,763 to Yoshioka; and claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in view of Barros and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,479 to Barton. These rejections are traversed with respect to the present pending claims, for at least the reasons given below.

In its rejection of claim 1, the Office Action asserts that column 11, lines 35-55 of Barros discloses that if a landmark corresponding to a designated position exists, a textual expression pertaining to a name and contents of the corresponding landmark is output to a search engine, as a keyword to present a search result. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion.

In particular, in Barros, a user clicks on a particular map grid, and then the user can view features within that grid and compare features of that grid with other grids. See Figure 3 of Barros, for example. The features of each map grid are obtained from a topical database 203, as seen in Figure 4 of Barros. Column 11, lines 35-55 of Barros merely describes that information from secondary and third-party databases can be retrieved, to thereby provide additional information to the user. For one thing, there is no disclosure of suggestion that Barros' back-end databases 504 are databases on the World-Wide Web; rather, they appear to be databases on private networks that can only be accessed via the back-end 502 of the system. For another thing, in the present invention as recited in claim 1, the 3D image browser outputs to the search engine a textual expression pertaining to a name and contents of the corresponding landmark as

a keyword to present a search result obtained by the search engine. In Barros, at best, information concerning a particular map grid selected by a user is obtained from both the topical database 203 and from back-end databases 504, whereby there is no disclosure or suggestion in Barros as to using attribute information obtained from the topical database 203 as keywords to search for particular information in the back-end databases 504. Note in particular the direction of the arrows in Figure 4, whereby the back-end databases 504 provide data to the topical database 203 (and thereby to the user), and whereby there is no arrow and thus no data flow from the topical database 203 to the back-end databases.

Therefore, for at least the reasons given above, presently pending independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited art of record. Presently pending independent claim 8 recites features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, and thus claim 8 is also patentable over the cited art of record.

The remaining dependent claims under rejection are patentable due to their respective dependencies on either claim 1 or claim 8, as well as for the specific features recited in those dependent claims.

Therefore, since there are no other objections or rejections raised in the Office Action, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

July 19, 2004
Date

Phillip J. Articola
Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 672-5300

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399